

Dear FCC,I just learned of this issue today via an SBA e-mail newsletter. This is my first comment to FCC, and rushed to boot, so pardon my not knowing protocol, and the not-so-well developed presentation.

I would truly appreciate the FCC's consideration of the perspectives of a private citizen living in a Boston suburb who would greatly relish truly competitive broadband Internet service offerings.

Verizon does offer DSL service in my town. However, I am not eligible since my residence is ~23,000 wire feet from the CO, not to mention that my wireline service is a combination of copper and fiber. I know that my situation is representative of millions of private citizens who live in "rural suburban" America.

My quick read of Verizon's 20 Dec 2004 petition "... for Forbearance under 47 U.S.C. 5 160(c) from Title I1 and Computer Inquiry Rules with Respect to Their Broadband Services" leads me to conclude that Verizon excludes from consideration its wireline voice customers who have just one cable service provider from which to choose for broadband Internet service.

Through this single cable service provider, my cost for broadband Internet access would be over \$60 per month. I do not subscribe to this cable provider's television services, and do not intend to just to get "cable modem" service, which combined would cost over \$70 per month.

I am constantly reminded and teased by Verizon's television ads promising DSL for less than \$30 per month. My neighbors and I, of course, are not able to take advantage of this very cost-competitive offering. Because there truly is no competition in our area. Verizon simply ignores those of us who are outside of the area presently served by its DSL offering.

Verizon had started deployment of "remote terminal"-based DSL service in neighboring communities to overcome the ~15,000 wire-foot limitation of DSL. I learned from Verizon's local Outside Plant Engineering Manager of Verizon's progress installing remote terminals in nearby communities. But no remote terminals were planned to

service my area of Littleton.

I eventually learned from a Verizon public affairs manager that Verizon had shifted its focus away from remote terminal deployment to fiber-to-the-residence --- with a promise of much improved capacity and services. No commitment from Verizon as to when that fiber-based service might be installed in my area of Littleton. But any pragmatist would conclude from history, and a quick assessment of the economics of population density, that those of us in "rural suburban" areas will be waiting a long time for truly competitive broadband Internet service offerings that would include Verizon's fiber service.

So my perspective from "rural suburban" America is that there are many of us who would instantly subscribe to Verizon's DSL offering given the opportunity. We are technologically sophisticated enough to understand the differences between the shared-bandwidth reality of a cable modem offering and the dedicated bandwidth of DSL. Not to mention the security implications of being on a shared-LAN service and not knowing the technical sophistication or integrity of the others sharing the LAN. (I'm a retired IT security manager, so I have a reasonable technical understanding of both networking and security issues. Other professionals who prefer "rural suburban" living are are similarly technically sophisticated and would switch to DSL service given the choice.)

My belief is that by allowing shared access to telecommunication infrastructure by truly entrepreneurial CLECs, the FCC will foster very competitive service offerings to the underserved and overcharged citizens in "rural suburban" America. This would be an FCC decision that will truly serve the best interests of the private citizens of America who are underrepresented in matters such as this.

Thank you for your patience reading and considering this, and for your consideration of a private citizen's perspective.

Ron Martin

-----040606070302040007070802

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
<!DOCTYPE html PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.01 Transitional//EN">
<html>
<head>
  <meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=ISO-8859-1">
  <title></title>
</head>
<body>
<meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=ISO-8859-1">
<title></title>
  <code class="red">ECFS - Email Filing<br>
  &lt;PROCEEDING&gt;</code> 04-440<br>
  <code class="red">&lt;DATE&gt;</code> 03/10/2005<br>
  <code class="red">&lt;NAME&gt;</code> Ronald A.Martin<br>
  <code class="red">&lt;ADDRESS1&gt;</code> Box 1406<br>
  <code class="red">&lt;ADDRESS2&gt;</code> <br>
  <code class="red">&lt;CITY&gt;</code> Littleton<br>
  <code class="red">&lt;STATE&gt;</code> MA<br>
  <code class="red">&lt;ZIP&gt;</code> 01460-4406<br>
  <code class="red">&lt;LAW-FIRM&gt;</code> <br>
  <code class="red">&lt;ATTORNEY&gt;</code> <br>
  <code class="red">&lt;FILE-NUMBER&gt;</code> <br>
  <code class="red">&lt;DOCUMENT-TYPE&gt;</code> CO<br>
  <code class="red">&lt;PHONE-NUMBER&gt;</code> <br>
  <code class="red">&lt;DESCRIPTION&gt;</code> Verizon Broadband Forbearance
Petition<br>
  <code class="red">&lt;CONTACT-EMAIL&gt;</code> <a
class="moz-txt-link-abbreviated"
href="mailto:ronald.a.martin@att.net">ronald.a.martin@att.net</a><br>
  <code class="red">&lt;TEXT&gt;</code> Dear FCC,<br>
  I just learned of this issue today via an SBA e-mail newsletter.&nbsp; This<br>
  is my first comment to FCC, and rushed to boot, so pardon my not<br>
  knowing protocol, and the not-so-well developed presentation.<br>
  <br>
  I would truly appreciate the FCC's consideration of the perspectives<br>
  of a private citizen living in a Boston suburb who would greatly<br>
  relish truly competitive broadband Internet service offerings.<br>
  <br>
```

Verizon does offer DSL service in my town.&nbsp; However, I am not eligible<br>since my residence is ~23,000 wire feet from the CO, not to mention<br>that my wireline service is a combination of copper and fiber.&nbsp; I know<br>that my situation is representative of millions of private citizens<br>who live in "rural suburban" America.<br>

<br>

My quick read of Verizon's 20 Dec 2004 petition "... for Forbearance<br>under 47 U.S.C. 5 160(c) from Title I1 and Computer Inquiry Rules with<br>Respect to Their Broadband Services" leads me to conclude that Verizon<br>excludes from consideration its wireline voice customers who have just<br>one cable service provider from which to choose for broadband Internet<br>service.<br>

<br>

Through this single cable service provider, my cost for broadband<br>Internet access would be over \$60 per month.&nbsp; I do not subscribe to<br>this cable provider's television services, and do not intend to just<br>to get "cable modem" service, which combined would cost over \$70 per<br>month.<br>

<br>

I am constantly reminded and teased by Verizon's television ads<br>promising DSL for less than \$30 per month.&nbsp; My neighbors and I, of<br>course, are not able to take advantage of this very cost-competitive<br>offering.&nbsp; Because there truly is no competition in our area.&nbsp; Verizon<br>simply ignores those of us who are outside of the area presently<br>served by its DSL offering.<br>

<br>

Verizon had started deployment of "remote terminal"-based DSL service<br>in neighboring communities to overcome the ~15,000 wire-foot<br>limitation of DSL.&nbsp; I learned from Verizon's local Outside Plant<br>Engineering Manager of Verizon's progress installing remote terminals<br>in nearby communities.&nbsp; But no remote terminals were planned to<br>service my area of Littleton.<br>

<br>

I eventually learned from a Verizon public affairs manager that<br>Verizon had shifted its focus away from remote terminal deployment to<br>fiber-to-the-residence --- with a promise of much improved capacity<br>and services.&nbsp; No commitment from Verizon as to when that fiber-based<br>service might be installed in my area of Littleton.&nbsp; But any<br>pragmatist would conclude from history, and a quick assessment of the<br>

economics of population density, that those of us in "rural suburban"<br>  
areas will be waiting a long time for truly competitive broadband<br>  
Internet service offerings that would include Verizon's fiber service.<br>  
<br>

So my perspective from "rural suburban" America is that there are<br>  
many of us who would instantly subscribe to Verizon's DSL offering<br>  
given the opportunity.&nbsp; We are technologically sophisticated enough<br>  
to understand the differences between the shared-bandwidth reality<br>  
of a cable modem offering and the dedicated bandwidth of DSL.<br>  
Not to mention the security implications of being on a shared-LAN<br>  
service and not knowing the technical sophistication or integrity of<br>  
the others sharing the LAN.&nbsp; (I'm a retired IT security manager, so I<br>  
have a reasonable technical understanding of both networking and<br>  
security issues.&nbsp; Other professionals who prefer "rural suburban"<br>  
living are are similarly technically sophisticated and would switch to <br>  
DSL service given the choice.)<br>  
<br>

My belief is that by allowing shared access to telecommunication<br>  
infrastructure by truly entrepreneurial CLECs, the FCC will foster<br>  
verry competitive service offerings to the underserved and overcharged<br>  
citizens in "rural suburban" America.&nbsp; This would be an FCC decision<br>  
that will truly serve the best interests of the private citizens of<br>  
America who are underrepresented in matters such as this.<br>  
<br>

Thank you for your patience reading and considering this, and for your<br>  
consideration of a private citizen's perspective.<br>  
<br>

&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;  Ron Martin<br>

</body>  
</html>

-----040606070302040007070802--